

Remarks

Entry of the amendments, reconsideration of the application, as amended, and allowance of all pending claims are respectfully requested. Claims 1 and 4-36 remain pending.

The independent claims have been amended to more particularly point out and distinctly claim an aspect of applicants' claimed invention. In particular, the mapping feature has been further clarified. Support for this amendment can be found throughout the specification, i.e., Page 56, lines 25-27; page 57, lines 2-11. Thus, no new matter is added.

In the Office Action dated February 14, 2003, the drawings are objected to because reference numerals were not used in FIGs. 3 and 23. Without acquiescing to this objection, applicants have revised those drawings to provide reference numerals. In accordance with the Revised Amendment Format, replacement figures which include the desired changes without markings are enclosed herewith. Based on the foregoing, applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the objection.

Additionally, claims 1, 4, 7-15, 18-27 and 30-36 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Miller et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,475,819). Further, claims 5, 6, 16, 17, 28 and 29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Miller in view of Oguchi et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,304,912). Applicants respectfully, but most strenuously, traverse these rejections for the reasons below.

In one aspect of applicants' invention, system traffic of a clustered computing environment is controlled. In order to provide this control, a particular node address is coupled to a particular routing table of a given network object according to the network configuration. That is, a node address is mapped to a particular "configuration profile" based on the network topology.

In one example, applicants claim a method of controlling system traffic of a clustered computing environment. The method includes, for instance, mapping one or more node addresses, for a service to be provided, to one or more network objects defined for the service, wherein the mapping of a node address maps the node address to a particular network object of a plurality of network objects based on network topology; obtaining from the one or more network

objects one or more priorities of the service; and contacting the service based on the one or more priorities. Thus, in applicants' claimed invention, a node address is used to get to a particular network object which contains the priority associated with that address in that network. Thus, a client is pointed to a particular "configuration profile" based on network topology. This is very different from the teachings of Miller.

For example, Miller describes the use of a single configuration profile maintained by a name service in order to resolve the issue of selecting one of several service providers. (Abstract, lines 5-10). Although the configuration profile may have several entries or levels (FIG. 5), each client still accesses the same overall configuration profile in order to determine the priorities at which to contact services. This is in sharp contrast to applicants' claimed invention in which there are multiple "configuration profiles," and a specific mapping of a configuration profile to a particular node address based on network topology. That is, each node address is associated with a particular service routing table ("configuration profile") based on the network topology. This is described, for instance, in FIGs. 22 & 23 and pp. 57-59 of applicants' specification. Unlike Miller, applicants' take a given node address and based on the topology of the network (see, e.g., subnetwork mask and network name of FIG. 23), finds its corresponding service routing table that includes the priority for the requested service that is associated with that particular address. Thus, Node A on Network A would contact one service routing table and obtain one set of priorities, while Node B on Network B would contact another service routing table to obtain another set of priorities (see, e.g., p. 58, lines 1-15). This is very different from the teachings of Miller in which there is only one configuration profile for the entire system and not different profiles based on topology.

Since Miller fails to describe, teach or suggest a mapping of a node address to a particular configuration file based on topology, Miller fails to describe, teach or suggest applicants' claimed invention. Thus, applicants respectfully submit that Miller does not anticipate applicants' claimed invention.

For the above reasons, applicants respectfully request an indication of allowability for all independent claims. Moreover, the dependent claims are patentable for the same reasons as the independent claims, as well as for their own additional features. Applicants respectfully submit

that Cain does not overcome the deficiencies of Miller. Thus, applicants respectfully request an indication of allowability for all pending claims.

Should the Examiner wish to discuss this case with applicants' attorney, please contact applicants' attorney at the below listed number.

Respectfully submitted,

Blanche E. Schiller
Blanche E. Schiller
Attorney for Applicants
Registration No.: 35,670

Dated: July 14, 2003.

HESLIN ROTHENBERG FARLEY & MESITI P.C.
5 Columbia Circle
Albany, New York 12203-5160
Telephone: (518) 452-5600
Facsimile: (518) 452-5579